REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Official Action mailed June 7, 2005 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Double Patenting

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1 – 19 under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claim 35 of copending publication number 2004/0145348. In view of the comments and amendments herein, it is respectfully submitted that all of the outstanding rejections are resolved, and therefore the provisional double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in the instant application. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the provisional double patenting rejection of claims 1 – 19 be withdrawn and the instant application allowed to issue. See MPEP §804 I. B. and C.

35 USC §102 rejections

The Examiner rejected claim 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 13 – 17 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Saeki et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,452,364, hereinafter "Saeki"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants amended claim 1 is directed to an AC/DC or DC/DC adapter for providing DC power via at least one power line to a portable electronic device. In addition to providing DC power via at least one power line to a portable device, claim 1 requires the adapter comprises "circuitry to generate an identification signal proportional to a maximum adapter current

available from said adapter." This enables the adapter to be used with many types of portable electronic devices.

Saeki is generally directed to battery charge control circuitry. See the Title and Abstract of Saeki. Saeki teaches an ACDC adapter 1 that is coupled to an AC power supply 2 to convert AC into DC. Column 1, lines 65 – 67. The DC input power is provided via a power line to the power supply connector 3. The adapter 1 taught by Saeki is a conventional adapter and Saeki does not teach any particular internal circuitry of the adapter as Saeki is more concerned with battery charge control circuitry of an associated device. As such, Saeki does not disclose, teach, or suggest an adapter having "circuitry to generate an identification signal proportional to a maximum adapter current available from said adapter" as required by claim 1.

The Examiner had cited to column 4, lines 55 – 62 of Saeki which states:

> While the power is supplied from the AC adapter 1 to the load 6, the error amplifier 17 increases and decreases the charging current for the battery 5 as the power consumption by the load 6 increases and decreases. By doing so, the error amplifier 17 controls the charging current so that the sum of the current consumed by the load 6 and the charging current for the battery 5 equals the maximum power capacity of the AC adapter 1.

The error amplifier 17 referenced by Saeki is part of the control unit 7 as shown in FIG. 2 of Saeki, and is not part of the adapter 1. The error amplifier 17 receives a signal from the differential amplifier 15 which in turn is coupled to the sense resistor R1 illustrated in FIG. 1 of Saeki. The sense resistor R1 is coupled to a power line from the adapter 1 and provides a signal proportional to the actual current being provided by the adapter at a particular instant in time, not the maximum adapter current. In addition, the sense resistor R1 is not part of the adapter.

In summary, Saeki does not disclose, teach, or suggest an adapter having "circuitry to generate an identification signal proportional to a maximum adapter current available from said adapter" as required by claim 1. Rather, Saeki teaches a conventional adapter 1 to provide DC power via a power line to a device.

Claims 2 – 5 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit claims 2 – 5 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 1 in addition to their own further limitations.

Claim 6 is an independent claim directed to an adapter topology system comprising "an AC/DC or DC/DC adapter comprising circuitry to generate an identification signal proportional to a maximum adapter current available from said adapter." For similar reasons adduced above regarding independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit claim 6 is also allowable.

Claims 7 – 12 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 6. Applicants respectfully submit claims 7 – 12 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 6 in addition to their own further limitations.

Claim 13 is an independent claim directed to a "portable electronic device, comprising circuitry to receive an identification signal proportional to a maximum adapter current supplied to said portable electronic device and a charger controller by an AC/DC or DC/DC adapter." For similar reasons adduced above regarding independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit claim 13 is also allowable. In particular, Saeki does not disclose, teach, or suggest a portable electronic device comprising "circuitry to receive an identification signal proportional to a maximum adapter current supplied to said portable electronic device and a charger controller by an AC/DC or DC/DC adapter" as required by claim 13. Saeki teaches a device that receives

power from the adapter 1 and a signal from the sense resistor R1 proportional to the actual current being provided by the adapter 1, not the maximum adapter current. An additional reference source 13 supplying Vref1 to amplifier 17 is necessary to provide a signal set to the maximum current supplied from the adapter 1. Column 3, lines 47 – 55.

Claims 14 - 19 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 13. Applicants respectfully submit claims 14 - 19 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 13 in addition to their own further limitations.

35 USC §103 rejections

The Examiner indicated claims 3, 4, 8 – 12, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Saeki in view of Patino et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,184,059, hereinafter "Patino"). Applicants believe the Examiner inadvertently referred to this as a 35 USC §102 rejection when it was to be a 35 USC §103 rejection since the Examiner indicates Saeki has missing teachings and relies on Patino to provide the missing teachings. Applicants are therefore treating this as a 35 USC §103 rejection.

Claims 3 and 4 depend directly from independent claim 1 and thus incorporate all the limitations of claim 1. As earlier detailed regarding claim 1, Saeki does not teach, suggest, or disclose an adapter having "circuitry to generate an identification signal proportional to a maximum adapter current available from said adapter" as required by claim 1. Patino does not provide this missing teaching.

Patino is generally directed to "batteries and chargers, and more specifically to a scheme for detecting the capacity of a battery, to provide an optimum charging strategy." Column 1,

lines 6 – 8. Patino teaches a charging circuit 30a of a charger 30 having a charger pocket 30b. See FIG. 1 of Patino. The charger pocket 30b provides positive 22 and negative contacts 26 to the battery 12 and/or the device inserted into the charger pocket 30b. See Column 2, lines 44 – 55. The charger pocket 30b does not have any additional "circuitry to generate an identification signal proportional to a maximum adapter current available from said adapter" as required by claim 1.

In summary, neither Saeki nor Patino, alone or in combination, teach "circuitry to generate an identification signal proportional to a maximum adapter current available from said adapter" as required by claim 1. Claims 3 – 4 depend from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit claims 3 – 4 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 1 in addition to their own further limitations.

Claims 8 - 12 depend directly from independent claim 6 and thus incorporate all the limitations of claim 6. As earlier detailed regarding claim 6, Saeki does not teach, suggest, or disclose an adapter having "circuitry to generate an identification signal proportional to a maximum adapter current available from said adapter" as required by claim 1. Patino does not provide this missing teaching. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit claims 8 -12 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 6 in addition to their own further limitations.

Claims 18 and 19 depend from independent claim 13 and thus incorporate all the limitations of claim 13. As earlier detailed regarding claim 13, Saeki does not teach, suggest, or disclose a "portable electronic device, comprising circuitry to receive an identification signal proportional to a maximum adapter current supplied to said portable electronic device and a charger controller by an AC/DC or DC/DC adapter" as required by claim 13. Patino does not

provide this missing teaching. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit claims 18 and 19 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 13 in addition to their own further limitations.

Having dealt with all the objections raised by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that the present application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Thus, early allowance is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner desires personal contact for further disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned Attorney at 603.668.6560.

In the event there are any fees due, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 50-2121.

Respectfully submitted,

Edmund P. Pfleger
Attorney For Applicants
Registration No. 41,252